



# Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

ROBERT B. THOMSON, Clerk  
Log Hill Road  
CARLISLE, MASS.

## Office of PLANNING BOARD

February 22, 1972

### PUBLIC HEARING REPORT

On February 14, 1972, following the publication of notice of time, place and subject matter on Jan. 27 and Feb. 3 in the Concord Journal, a public hearing was convened at 8:00 p.m. in the Selectmen's Office by the Planning Board to consider proposed changes to Articles IV and VI of the Bylaws of the Town of Carlisle. Messers Evans, Herndon, Jones, Macone and Thomson represented the Planning Board.

The proposed revision of item 3, Section 12 of Article IV was read by Mr. Herndon, and he explained that the Board felt that reducing the paved roadway width requirement for short streets was in keeping with the rural character of the town and did not pose any problems with regard to maintenance, plowing or public safety. A question was asked from the floor regarding how the Planning Board could be certain that such a short street would not be extended in the future to serve more houses. Mr. Thomson pointed out several existing examples of short streets that were either internal to a subdivision or which backed up on marsh or swamp as illustrating the kind of situation which would mitigate against future extension. Mr. Herndon noted that if such a short street were to end at open back land, the Board would not permit the reduced width. Another member of the audience stated that such a reduction in width was tantamount to reducing the "road building standards of the Town", which was unacceptable in the speaker's opinion. A question was asked about the safety of the 18 foot wide paved road for pedestrian travel. Mr. Macone replied that such a road was adequate for pedestrian travel, and that there had been considerable negative commentary over recent years about the wide (24!) straight subdivision roads being responsible for higher vehicular speeds and more accidents.

There being no other questions, Mr. Herndon then read the proposed revision of Section 5.B. of Article VI, and explained that in addition to some wording changes to hopefully clarify the meaning of the Section, the addition of the wording "there is not more than one other such lot with frontage contiguous to it" was new. The reason for this change was that a group of five so-called "porkchop" lots had been brought to the Board for Approval Not Required signature and although the Board signed the plan, it felt that so many such lots involving about 23 acres of land really tended to constitute a subdivision. However, under the provisions of the Bylaw, the Board and Town had no control over the situation which was felt to be unsatisfactory. Thus, limiting the number of such lots would prevent the reoccurrence of this situation, and at the same time retain the original intent of the Article. There were no questions or comments from the floor on this proposed change.

The hearing was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

*Terry O. Herndon*  
Terry O. Herndon Chairman